

Remarks

1. Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action mailed April 7, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 8-9, 11, 16-17, 33, and 40-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,343,212 (Weber et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,778,304 (Grube et al.). The Examiner rejected claim 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber et al. in view of Grube et al. and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0031641 (Ung et al.).

2. Pending Claims

Applicant has amended claim 11, cancelled claims 8-9, and added new claims 44-61. Now pending in this application are claims 11, 16-17, 33, and 40-61, of which claims 11 and 53 are independent. New claim 52 is identical to cancelled claim 9.

3. Response to Claim Rejections

a. Claims 8-9, 11, 16-17, 33, and 40-42

The Examiner rejected claims 8-9, 11, 16-17, 33, and 40-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber et al. in view of Grube et al. Applicant has amended independent claim 11 and added new independent claim 53. Amended claim 11 and new claim 53 clearly distinguish over the combination of Weber et al. and Grube et al., because the combination of Weber et al. and Grube et al. fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of either of these claims.

In particular, with respect to claim 11, the combination of Weber et al. and Grube et al. does not disclose or suggest wherein the first entity comprises at least one transmitter radiating the control signal in a radiation pattern defining a boundary of the given location. With respect to claim 53, the combination of Weber et al. and Grube et al. does not disclose or suggest

wherein the first entity is an entity selected from the group consisting of: (i) a mobile switching center (MSC), (ii) a base station controller (BSC), and (iii) a service control point (SCP).

Claims 11 and 53 both recite "when the device is in a given location, the device receiving from a first entity a control signal associated with the given location and the device responsively asking a second entity for a set of alternative control logic to be executed by the device when the device receives the ring signal." In rejecting claim 11, the Examiner asserted that Grube et al. teaches the device receiving from a first entity a control signal associated with the given location and the device responsively requesting a second entity for a set of alternative control logic, and the Examiner cited to Grube et al., col. 3, lines 10-52. This section of Grube et al. teaches a communication unit having a GPS receiver that determines location coordinates, the communication unit transmits its location as location coordinates to a communication resource controller, and the communication resource controller transmits to the communication unit a predefined message that may alter or reconfigure communication services that may be requested by the communication unit.

The Examiner does not explicitly state what element(s) of Grube et al., col. 3, lines 10-52, teaches the device receiving from a first entity a control signal associated with the given location. However, based on the Examiner's assertion regarding Grube et al., it appears the Examiner is asserting that Grube et al.'s disclosure of the location coordinates being received at the GPS receiver teaches the claimed function of the device receiving from a first entity a control signal associated with the given location. However, Grube et al., alone or in combination with Weber et al., does not teach or suggest wherein the first entity comprises at least one transmitter radiating the control signal in a radiation pattern defining a boundary of the given location, as recited in claim 1, or wherein the first entity is an entity selected from the group consisting of a

mobile switching center (MSC), a base station controller (BSC), and a service control point (SCP), as recited in claim 53.

Because the combination of Weber et al. and Grube et al. fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claims 11 and 53, Applicant submits that claims 11 and 53 are allowable. Further, because each of claims 16-17, 33, 40-52, and 54-61 depend from either claim 11 or claim 53 and necessarily include all of the elements of either claim 11 or claim 53, claims 16-17, 33, 40-52, and 54-61 are allowable as well.

b. Claim 43

The Examiner rejected claim 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Weber et al., Grube et al., and Ung et al. The combination of Weber et al., Grube et al., and Ung et al. does not disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claim 11, nor does it disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claim 43, which depends from claim 11 and necessarily includes all of the limitations of claim 11.

The combination of Weber et al. and Grube et al. has been discussed above, and that discussion is applicable here. Ung et al. is also silent as to: wherein the first entity comprises at least one transmitter radiating the control signal in a radiation pattern defining a boundary of the given location, as recited in claim 11.

Because Ung et al. does not cure the deficiencies of Weber et al. and Grube et al., Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of dependent claim 43 should be withdrawn.

4. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 11, 16-17, 33, and 40-61 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

**MCDONNELL BOEHNNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Date: JUNE 23, 2006

By: David L. Ciesielski
David L. Ciesielski
Reg. No. 57,432